DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 483 JC 850 106

AUTHOR Cantrell, Charles C.
TITLE A Comparison of Various Teaching Philosophies and Qualifications at a Selected Kentucky Community College.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 66p.; Graduate seminar paper, Tennessee Technological University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; *Educational Philosophy; Females; Full Time Faculty; Males; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Qualifications; *Teaching Methods; Teaching Styles; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Elizabethtown Kentucky Community College

ABSTRACT

This report presents a discussion of the educational philosophy of community college instructors and provides results of a study of full-time faculty members at Elizabethtown Kentucky Community College (EKCC) conducted to compare the philosophy and values of community college faculty and the implications of the differences among faculty for education in the community colleges. After introductory material discusses the role of the community colleges in Kentucky, chapter 2 provides a review of the literature on community colleges and their instructors, including a discussion of the goals and functions of the colleges, different approaches to teaching among community college faculty, and classifications of instructor types in the colleges. Chapter 3 provides results of a study of 39 of 43 full-time faculty members at EKCC conducted to examine differences in philosophical attitudes and values regarding education among the faculty surveyed. The study results indicated that a much higher percent of female instructors were student-oriented than male instructors; and that the holders of higher degrees were less likely to accept new teaching ideas and were more subject-oriented than their counterparts who did not possess higher degrees. Chapter 4 then provides conclusions drawn from the study, including a questioning of the value of possession of a doctoral degree for community college faculty; a suggestion that the colleges hire faculty who have taken courses in teaching techniques, testing, and technology, and a course in the history and philosophy of the community college; and a classification of faculty into types based on their philosophical orientation toward teaching. The survey instrument is appended. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257483

A COMPARISON OF VARIOUS TEACHING PHILOSOPHIES AND QUALIFICATIONS AT A SELECTED KENTUCKY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

A Study
Presented to:
Dr. R. K. Fletcher of The College of Education
Tennessee Technological University

In fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Course
SEED 791

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. CANTRELL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

by
Charles C. Cantrell
Spring, 1984

IC 850 106

Abstract

This study was undertaken in order to categorize the full-time faculty members of Elizabethtown Kentucky Community College as either "Student-oriented teachers" or "Subject-oriented academicians" and to correlate their chosen philosophy with their particular area of specialization. Results of the survey indicated that, at this institution at least, there appears to exist a noticeable degree of conflict between the educational philosophies of instructors of two-year terminal degree students and that of the community college as originally conceived. Ideas to alleviate this discrepancy were presented including closer scrutinization of job applicants and/or the implementation of additional in-service programs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1

PURPOSE 1

LIMITATIONS 2

2. TODAY'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THEIR INSTRUCTORS 3

3. THE STUDY 17

4. CONCLUSIONS 39

REFERENCES 52

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 53

APPENDIX 54

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Background information	18
2.	Teaching Philosophies and Values	22
3.	Significant Cross Tabulations	30
4.	Philosophical Tendencies	42
5.	A Comparison of Teaching Philosophies and Preparations of Instructors of Two- and Four-year Degree Students	44
6.	An Estimation of the Percent of the Elizabethtown Faculty Populating Brawer's Classifications of Teacher Types	47
7.	An Estimation of the Percent of the Elizabethtown Faculty Populating Freeman's Classifications of Teacher Types	47
8.	An Estimation of the Percent of the Elizabethtown Faculty Populating Boart's Classification of Teacher Types	48

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The Community College System of the state of Kentucky is placed in a relatively unusual position in that upon its inception it has resided under the authority of the University of Kentucky. Having extremely close ties to the University, the community colleges act vigorously as university extension campuses for those students planning to transfer to four-year institutions. In addition, these colleges serve as community colleges in the strictest sense of the word, that is, offering two-year terminal degrees for the local non-university bound students. Prior to the 1970's, these dual role institutions would have been referred to as junior-community colleges but today the term "community college" has become a catchall phrase, hence the title of Kentucky system.

Within a typical dual role Kentucky community college, a hodgepodge of various teacher and student types abound. By evaluating one of these institutions, Elizabethtown Community College, this researcher will attempt to categorize teachers and correlate the degree of compatibility with their students for the sake of future class assignments and the hiring of new faculty. A review of today's students, the role of the community college, and of teacher types and techniques will be given in the following chapter to be followed by the compatibility survey and summary.

Limitations

Limitations imposed upon this study are primarily those concerning a lack of community college literature published since the mid 1970's.

Chapter 2

TODAY'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THEIR INSTRUCTORS

It has been repeatedly pointed out that there are many motives for one attending college. Upper class families regard college education as the traditional way for their youngsters to maintain their position in society. Others may attend for purposes such as career training or even marriage. Those who attend strictly for scholarship, it appears, constitute but a small minority.[1] For whatever reason they attend, today's student body is composed of a larger number of "average" learners and those of marginal quality whose abilities would not have earned admission several decades ago. A large percentage of today's high school graduates cannot read, write, figure, or think well enough to succeed in traditional freshman college courses.[2]

According to Rouche, "Colleges must become halfway houses for equipping persons who have experienced little success in their early lives with the skills and abilities to take charge of their lives and become productive, responsible, and informed citizens".[3] Many professors desire to teach only bright, highly motivated students and cling to the idea that the quality of education would be improved if entrance requirements were higher and the higher the better. This elitists viewpoint is unquestionably correct but our society requires a much larger quantity of educated

persons to survive, as compared to the few students elitists desire to teach. Today's students, who previously would not be admitted to college, must be provided with a curricula that meets their needs. As these students increase in number on campus, the institution's philosophies are affected. Rouche states:

> The population of individuals considered "college material" is declining and as it declines, educational institutions will be competing with the more diverse student population ..... The community college with its track record in developmental education will become the college of diversity. It is the institution to which the poor, the disaffected, the hard-core "loser" will turn for aid in exploring the options that will give them a better chance of survival in an increasingly hostile and complex world.[4]

This is evident due to the fact that many, if not a majority, of students entering open-door community colleges hail from the lower one half of their high school class, both academically and socioeconomically.[5] Institutions of higher learning have responded to this dilemma in a variety of ways and due to this variation of goals and objectives, it becomes difficult to generalize. Within the walls of these institutions, instructors are still asking, "exactly what is this college set up to do ...?"[6]

Invariably, community colleges have been labelled, among other things, as high schools with ashtrays whose majority of students are completing the last graded formal stage of education. Community colleges therefore attempt to be all things to all people that is, serving as "custodian, trainer, stimulant,

behavior-shaper, counselor, adviser, and caretaker to both young and old."[7]

Most community colleges have developed a smorgasboard-style of curriculum due to their precarious position between the universities desiring better prepared incoming students and the secondary schools which process through the marginally literate.[8] The resulting general objectives shared by most community colleges include the establishment of the following. First is the afore-mentioned comprehensive curriculum, while secondly, all must maintain close ties to the community in which they are located including the reflection of local traditions and values. It must be noted that by and large, students attending the universities are more responsive to the acceptance of "liberal" ideas than their generally less-sophisticated counterparts at the community college. As a result, community college faculty members must thread the needle between stimulation and antagonism within their classrooms. Thirdly, most community colleges share the "open-door" philosophy as contrasted to the four year institutions' sink or swim policy which for many students is a certain road to disaster.[9] The 1969 Carnegie report indicated that eighty-six percent of the community college faculty questioned agreed with the statement, "Opportunities for higher education should be available for all who want it."[10] One goal of this student's survey is to attain whether or not this viewpoint is maintained today by the faculty members of the institution being surveyed. In addition to the above general goals, many of these institutions share the specific functions listed below:

(1) administrating transfer-oriented courses (Note - Too often upper division university courses are offered since these are the type of courses many established faculty members prefer to teach.)

(2) administrating a general education curricula

(3) providing occupational training

(4) administrating adult/continuing education

(5) providing remedial general studies' courses to below average students

(6) providing a custodial service for students unsure of their intentions (this necessary evil is the only hope for the "late bloomer")

(7) screening future university candidates.[11]

In reference to the last distasteful function, the open-door policy of most community colleges has relieved the universities of the responsibility of separating "fit" and "unfit" students. In the future, the community colleges may be placed under pressure from society to graduate all of its students. As a result, the value of a community college education will be diluted and could possibly mean little more than a certificate of attendance.[12]

As worthwhile as the above goals and functions appear, community colleges must gear towards quality and not simply quantity. Some innovations have possibly backfired as witnessed by the adoption of non-punitive grading. This "no credit" or "withdrawn" grade fostered grade inflation and the distortion of the credits transferred among institutions.[13] It should be pointed out that goals and even basic philosophies once held dear by these institutions may be altered as the chase for dollars becomes more rigorous during times of economic stagnation and of decreases in the numbers of high school graduates. According to O'Banion, "community colleges . . . . can develop a variety of educational programs; they can house these students and programs in attractive, modern facilities; but all these will

avail little if their staffs are not highly competent and well prepared for the unique tasks assigned them by this new venture in American education".[14] The priorities of community colleges and their supporters have come under criticism due to the enchantment with increasing numbers of students, building, and entire college by administrators, federal watchdogs, and professional associations with too little attention spent on staff development. The President's Advisory Council for Education Professions Development was conducted partially to evaluate the unique characteristics of the American Community College and to outline major preservice and inservice teacher programming. Among its recommendations were those concerning programs necessary to meet staff needs.[15]

Comparison between community college faculty members and their counterparts at the university indicate that a university professor is more subject-matter oriented whereas the community college instructors tend to be more student-centered. These generalities have led to the labelling of community colleges as "teaching institutions" as opposed to "research oriented" universities.[16]

Of the various groups of personnel employed by a community college, the teachers are by far the most important. O'Banion quotes Eells as stating that at least since 1931, "the community-junior college has had little or no excuse for existence if it does not place prime emphasis on superior teaching, superior instructors, and superior methods of instruction."[17] He also relates, as Thorton professed in 1960, that "either (the community-junior college) teaches excellently or it fails completely."[18]

Universities are largely guilty of investigating everything

but their own policies and practices. The average professor's publications and research may be scrutinized but rarely his teaching methods and effectiveness. To quote Engel, "it is difficult to imagine or identify any major occupation or profession in the U.S. that is as careless in the training and placement of its members as is the profession of college teaching."[19] Other profound statements have been made in the past suggesting that few or no U.S. community college instructors have been relieved of their position based on ineffective teaching. Dismissals have on the other hand been primarily based on failure to conform to prevailing social values or for political reasons.[20]

This brings up the problem of just what are the "proper" goals of instruction at the higher education level? To answer this enigmatic question one must examine the teacher's responsibilities. According to Justman and Mais,

> The teacher's responsibility is not only to share with students the substance of a field of learning, but also to stimulate and guide growth in mind, character, and personality. One is instrumental to the other. Instruction is most effective when the teacher knows (1) the ends of growth to which his teaching is directed, (2) the learning qualities of his students, and (3) the ways in which the subject matter may be shaped in order to serve its function.[21]

Unfortunately the idea persists that a college professor is, by title, a qualified professor of knowledge. This belief stems from medieval times when instruction was the responsibility of the church or a few individuals. "Professors" were commonly

selected due to the fact that they owned books or because they alone could read.[22] Cohen further relates:

> As the university evolved, the lecturer became exalted as scholar --- as one who worked with knowledge of a complex and esoteric nature. He alone understood relationships among abstract ideas; he alone used a specialized vocabulary; he knew concepts and theories, and others did not. His role became one of revealing the working of his mind to people who, by their presence, indicate their interest in his thinking. However, he did not become a professional instructor. His scholarly pursuits and his lecturing did not lead him to specialize in instruction per se.[23]

As late as the 1970's it was held by most instructors that instruction was a mere activity rather than an inclusive complex process.[24] This belief may still hold true.

The teacher must be more than a machine-like spouter of information. He must provide challenges and encounter experiences and not hide behind academic rigor and discipline.[25] In short, it is the teacher who makes or breaks the course. Do the community colleges in fact live up to their reputations as institutions of "good" teaching? Proof is difficult to come by as conclusive studies are few and far between. This is due partly to the enormous number of variables involved such as student ability, the criterion tests, and instructional procedures involved, the level of instruction, instructional methods, etc.[26] One major variable is that of instructor type. Most community college faculties are composed of a mixture of personalities

which have been modified by a variety of background experiences and teaching goals.[27] Most teachers combine the three traits of model, classroom manager, and mediator in various degrees.

In many instances, college teachers of undergraduate college courses unfortunately mimick their last professors, that is those of graduate courses. It must be noted that a professor who does not appeal to one student may appeal to another. It is evident however that he must appeal to the majority of his students. Many attempts to stereotype instructors have been made in the past. London (1978) for instance identified three basic groups. The first of these being teachers who subscribe to the idea that the students are masters of their own fates independent of teacher intervention. His second group included those which believe that students were products of society and needed special care to overcome deficiencies related to substandard backgrounds. His last group involved those which in addition to blaming society for the student's woes, desire to "politicize the students so they could compensate for what society had done to them."[28]

Brawer had previously attempted to divide community college teachers into the classifications of (1) end of the roaders, (2) ladder climbers, (3) job holders, and (4) defined - purpose routers. An end of the roader may or may not be a good teacher but has decided to remain in his position for a variety of reasons. Most probably enjoy community college teaching, especially when they become tenured. Her ladder climbers include those using the community college as a steppingstone to university

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

teaching. They are usually young and energetic and may well be a credit to the institution at which they are employed.[29] It is interesting to note one survey of community college faculty indicated that 75 percent of the respondents chose as "attractive" a teaching position at a four year college or university.[30]

In a separate study, Medsker and Tillery found 44.4 percent of the community college faculty members would prefer to work in four-year colleges or universities.[31] This type of instructor also responded positively to other items on various surveys establishing their position as the university being their reference group. Cohen points out that many of these have little community college experience and hold to the belief that a doctoral degree indicates that the holder is more capable and has a stronger orientation to his discipline,[32] thus explaining their enrollment in additional graduate courses. The identification with the university by some faculty may be appropriate in that by abolishing credential requirements, the four-year and two-year institutions relate more closely than do the two-year institutions and the secondary schools. This abolishment of certification in many states thus strengthens the community college professor as opposed to school teacher.[33] Some also feel that their status is elevated when the community college courses closely resemble those being taught at the university[34] (including graduate courses). Many of the university-oriented faculty are elitist in their views toward education and find it difficult to accept an open-door policy. Although it appear on the outset that there is no place for ivory-tower elitists on the community college

staff, curricula such as pre-medicine or pre-law demand faculty willing to separate the unfit from the fit.

Brawer's third classification, that of job holder, relates to part-time staff or those holding other jobs. She indicates that few of these instructors are excellent due to their desire for minimum teaching and contact hours. Her fourth group, the defined purpose routors, appear to be the best community college teachers in that they have dedicated themselves to the task of regardless of background or ability.[35]

In 1967, Friedman divided community college instructors into three categories, those of professors, graduate students, and high schoolers. Professors were individuals who had previously taught undergraduate students at a four-year institution and viewed their employment at a two-year college as a demotion in their professional status. Graduate students had recently left school, were not necessarily committed to a career in teaching and in many instances, resembled Brawer's ladder climbers. Friedman's high schoolers come from the public school systems who he claimed are subject-matter oriented and distainful of teaching methods.[36] Although the secondary school teacher has nearly disappeared as a reference group, the image of the community college being populated by ex-high school teachers persisted for some time. Presently a large percentage of faculty come from either the business world or graduate school.[37]

With the community college instructor existing in the no-man's land between the secondary school and the university, there appears an uncertainty of direction concerning goals and philosophies as

witnessed by the examination of the various teacher categories. It appears they are just now carving a permanent niche for themselves within the ranks of professional education.[38] Previously the community college has changed roles from a subbaccalaureate institution to a vocational training center to a compensatory teaching institution to an adult education enterprise returning to old roles while adopting new ones all within the span of a single instuctor's career.[39] It is no wonder that such confusion exists as to what is the proper technique for community college instruction.

It has been proven time and time again that there appears to be no one ideal teaching technique for all courses or students. To wit, the use of different techniques have been shown to make little or no difference in either student learning nor attitudes.[40]

Eckert and Neale agree with McKeachie that in the smaller classes and with independent study, students do become involved and interested in the subject matter even though no better results are evidenced on examinations. Dubin and Taveggia attribute the fact that students seem to learn as well under one method as another to the effect of a single common factor found in all types of teaching---the textbook. Since examinations tend to be based on textbooks, and students knowing this are motivated to do their own studying of the text, they thereby acquire the necessary knowledge or content to pass the course.[41]

In any event, the good teacher not only presents factual information but stimulates students to learn for themselves by comprehending principles, relationships and concepts. Often instructors cannot accept the idea that every student in his class

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

is not enthralled with enthusiasm for the subject at hand. Teaching on the college level does not reduce the need for motivation. It is the "good" teacher that can turn on poorly motivated students. Many styles of teaching have been identified but most of these are variations of 3 basic types. These three are the authoritarian approach, the spontaneous approach and the nucleus style. Common in the community college is the authoritarian style-especially in the natural and physical sciences in which the instructor prepares lectures in minute detail with little or no time allowed for discussion. Instructors utilizing this method view their job as presenting basic frameworks of concepts and ideas to those who do not yet possess them. The responsibility of the course rests entirely with the teacher. The teacher is an expert, and the students are ignorant.[42] According to Sherwin "female students, freshmen and sophomore students, and the shy and timid find this approach palatable."[43] Unfortunately cases of archaic formal discipline can still be found in many authoritative classrooms.

Lying at the opposite end of the spectrum is the spontaneous approach in which the instructor relegates all responsibility to the students for the utilization of classroom time. This style appears to be most used by younger teachers, especially those teaching upper level humanities course.[44] Between authoritaranism and the spontaneous (nondirected) approach is the nucleus approach which blends the two previously mentioned methods. Numerous variations within the nucleus approach stem from the degree of balance between authoritarianism and nondirectedness.[45]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Whichever method is chosen the effective teacher according to Romine can be characterized by the following:

1. has a sincere interest in the student.
2. knows how to teach as well as what to teach.
3. demonstrates enthusiasm.
4. explains clearly and is easy to follow and understand.
5. presents other points of view as well as his own.
6. is personable and has a sense of humor.
7. realizes when students are bored or confused.[46]

Ford adds the following traits to the excellent teacher model:

1. possess reason.
2. is experienced in teaching.
3. is organized.
4. has no favorites.
5. knows his subject.[47]

A good college instructor also sets prescribed goals, is democratic, is stimulating, is progressive, permits remedial activities, and liberates the learner.[48]

In contrast to the above specific traits, Brawer concludes that six general personality traits will decide if a person can become an outstanding educator. According to her, successful teachers: (1) enjoy their work, (2) are personally confident that they can resolve any of their own personal problems, (3) enjoy children and can relate to them, (4) are emotionally stable mature persons, (5) are creative and (6) are reasonably unselfish persons, modest and free from excessive ego.[49]

It is the purpose of the following study to categorize

the faculty members of Elizabethtown Community College as either "student-oriented teachers" or "subject-oriented academicians" and to correlate their chosen philosophy with their area of specialization.

Special attention will be given to those instructors who's students are primarily enrolled in two-year terminal degree programs for it is these students upon which the community college system is based.

Included in the questionnaire are also items dealing with the perceived role of the community college, the faculty's knowledge and ulitization of contemporary teaching techniques and the like.

Chapter 3

THE STUDY

The study conducted by this student at Elizabethtown Community College involved 39 of 48 full-time faculty members representing 81.25 percent. A sample of the instrument is included in the appendix of this paper.

The results of the survey are given in the following tables where values of one were applied to any "A" response, two to any "B" response, et cetera. Tables 1 and 2 indicate raw scores whereas Table 3 is of any cross tabulation significiant at the .05 level or better.

Table 1

Background Information

Item	Variables	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (%) *adjusted for any missing cases
1. Age:	(A) 22-30	6	15.4
	(B) 31-40	17	43.6
valid cases: 39	(C) 41-49	10	25.6
missing cases: 0	(D) 50-59	5	12.8
mean: 2.436	(E) 60 or over	1	2.6
median: 2.294			
2. Sex:	(A) Male	19	50.0*
	(B) Female	19	50.0*
valid cases: 38			
missing cases: 1			
3. Highest degree held:	(A) Bachelor's	1	2.6
	(B) Master's	34	87.2
valid cases: 39	(C) Specialist	1	2.6
missing cases: 0	(D) Doctorate	3	7.7
mean: 2.154			
median: 2.044			
std. dev.: 0.587			
4. Primary Assignment:	(A) Social or Behavioral Science	7	17.9
	(B) Business or Related Technologies	8	20.5
valid cases: 39	(C) Data Processing, Mathematics, Natural Science or Related Technologies	13	33.3
missing cases: 0			
mean: 2.718			
median: 2.846	(D) Humanities or Fine Arts	11	28.2
std. dev.: 1.075			

Table 1 (continued)

Item	Variables	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (%) *adjusted for any missing cases
5. Years taught in a community college: valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 2.308 median: 2.111 std. dev.: 1.217	(A) 0- 5 (B) 6-10 (C) 11-15 (D) 16-20 (E) 21 or over	14 9 6 10 0	35.9 23.1 15.4 25.6 0
6. Years taught in high school or technical school valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 1.538 median: 1.386 std. dev.: 0.720	(A) 0 (B) 1- 5 (C) 6- 10 (D) 11-15 (E) 16 or over	22 14 2 1 0	56.4 35.9 5.1 2.6 0
7. Years taught in a four-year college or university valid cases: 39 missing cases: mean: 1.436 median: 1.313 std. dev.: 0.0598	(A) 0 (B) 1- 5 (C) 6-10 (D) 11-15 (E) 16 or over	24 13 2 0 0	61.5 33.3 5.1 0 0
8. Years worked in your area outside of teaching valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 1.897 median: 1.679 std. dev.: 1.046	(A) 0 (B) 1- 5 (C) 6-10 (D) 11-15 (E) 16 or over	17 14 4 3 0	43.6 35.9 10.3 7.7 2.6

Table 1 (continued)

Item	Variables	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (%) *adjusted for any missing cases
9. Semester hours completed beyond last degree	(A) 0	10	25.6
	(B) 1- 9	11	28.2
	(C) 10-18	10	25.6
valid cases: 39	(D) 19-27	3	7.7
missing cases: 0	(E) 28 or more	5	12.8
mean: 2.538			
median: 2.364			
std. dev.: 1.315			
10. Semester hours of professional education course work	(A) 0	14	35.9
	(B) 1- 9	6	15.4
	(C) 10-18	7	17.9
	(D) 19-27	5	12.8
valid cases: 39	(E) 28 or more	7	17.9
missing cases: 0			
mean: 2.615			
median: 2.417			
std. dev.: 1.532			
11. Have you taken a college course in the history and philosophy of the community college?	(A) Yes	14	35.9
	(B) No	25	64.1
valid cases: 39			
missing cases: 0			
mean: 1.641			
median: 1.720			
std. dev.: 0.486			
12. Have you attended an indepth workshop or completed a college course in test construction and evaluation?	(A) Yes	24	61.5
	(B) No	15	38.5
valid cases: 39			
missing cases: 0			
mean: 1.385			
median: 1.313			
std. dev.: 0.493			

Item	Variables	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (%) *adjusted for any missing cases
13. Are most of your students enrolled in a two-year terminal degree program?	(A) Yes	18	46.2
	(B) No	16	41.0
	(C) Uncertain	5	12.8
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 1.667 median: 1.594 std. dev.: 0.701			
14. Have you previously served as a student teacher in a high school or as an intern in a community college?	(A) Yes	17	44.7*
	(B) No	21	55.3*
valid cases: 38 missing cases: 1 mean: 1.553 median: 1.595 std. dev.: 0.504			
15. Have you ever attended a community college as a student?	(A) Yes	10	25.6
	(B) No	29	74.4
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 1.744 median: 1.828 std. dev.: 0.442			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2

Teaching Philosophies and Values

Item	Variables	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (%) *adjusted for any missing cases
16. I believe that if you know a subject, you can teach it.	(A) Strongly Agree	1	2.7*
	(B) Agree	10	27.0*
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	2	5.4*
	(D) Disagree	14	37.8*
	(E) Strongly Disagree	10	27.0*
valid cases: 37 missing cases: 2 mean: 3.595 median: 3.893 std. dev.: 1.235			
17. I believe that a student should be able to retake a course for credit after having audited it.	(A) Strongly Agree	11	28.9*
	(B) Agree	18	47.4*
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	4	10.5*
	(D) Disagree	3	7.9*
	(E) Strongly Disagree	2	5.3*
valid cases: 38 missing cases: 1 mean: 2.135 median: 1.944 std. dev.: 1.095			
18. I believe that a student should be given credit for the highest grade of a retaken course as opposed to having the grades averaged together	(A) Strongly Agree	15	39.5*
	(B) Agree	12	31.6*
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	7	18.4*
	(D) Disagree	2	5.3*
	(E) Strongly Disagree	2	5.3*
valid cases: 38 missing cases: 1 mean: 2.053 median: 1.833 std. dev.: 1.138			

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Variables	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (%) *adjusted for any missing cases
19. I believe that faculty should be allowed additional time for research and publishing.	(A) Strongly Agree	11	28.9*
	(B) Agree	11	28.9*
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	13	34.2*
	(D) Disagree	3	7.9*
	(E) Strongly Disagree	0	0*
valid cases: 38 missing cases: 1 mean: 2.211 median: 2.227 std. dev.: 0.963			
20. I believe that a major goal of the community college is to weed out "unfit" students before they transfer to the university.	(A) Strongly Agree	1	2.6
	(B) Agree	4	10.3
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	5	12.8
	(D) Disagree	16	41.0
	(E) Strongly Disagree	13	33.3
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 3.923 median: 4.094 std. dev.: 1.061			
21. I believe that every instructor should possess a doctoral degree.	(A) Strongly Agree	2	5.1
	(B) Agree	0	0
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	4	10.3
	(D) Disagree	15	38.5
	(E) Strongly Disagree	18	46.2
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 4.205 median: 4.400 std. dev.: 1.005			
22. I am familiar with the construction and use of behavioral objectives.	(A) Strongly Agree	11	28.2
	(B) Agree	24	61.5
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	2	5.1
	(D) Disagree	1	2.6
	(E) Strongly Disagree	1	2.6
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 1.897 median: 1.854 std. dev.: 0.821			

Item	Variables	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (%) *adjusted for any missing cases
23. I believe that behavioral objectives are a great aid in learning.	(A) Strongly Agree	5	12.8
	(B) Agree	18	46.2
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	13	33.3
	(D) Disagree	2	5.1
	(E) Strongly Disagree	1	2.6
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 2.385 median: 2.306 std. dev.: 0.877			
24. I believe that in order to reduce the number of college applicants, an ACT cutoff should be instituted.	(A) Strongly Agree	2	5.1
	(B) Agree	4	10.3
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	6	15.4
	(D) Disagree	19	48.7
	(E) Strongly Disagree	8	20.5
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 3.692 median: 3.895 std. dev.: 1.080			
25. I believe that the memorization of detail is an effective method of mind development.	(A) Strongly Agree	1	2.6
	(B) Agree	9	23.1
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	12	30.8
	(D) Disagree	12	30.8
	(E) Strongly Disagree	5	12.8
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 3.282 median: 3.292 std. dev.: 1.050			
26. I believe that politics are important in obtaining a teaching job at a community college.	(A) Strongly Agree	0	0
	(B) Agree	8	20.5
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	9	23.1
	(D) Disagree	13	33.3
	(E) Strongly Disagree	9	23.1
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 3.590 median: 3.692 std. dev.: 1.069			

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Variables	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (%) *adjusted for any missing cases
27. I believe that decision concerning policy and curriculum should involve the community at large.	(A) Strongly Agree	2	5.1
	(B) Agree	16	41.0
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	8	20.5
	(D) Disagree	12	30.8
	(E) Strongly Disagree	1	2.6
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 2.846 median: 2.688 std. dev.: 1.014			
28. I believe that most students can be trusted.	(A) Strongly Agree	6	15.4
	(B) Agree	29	74.4
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	1	2.6
valid cases: 39	(D) Disagree	3	7.7
missing cases: 0	(E) Strongly Disagree	0	0.0
mean: 2.026 median: 1.966 std. dev.: 0.707			
29. I believe in a college admissions policy which allows any adult applicant to attend.	(A) Strongly Agree	8	21.1*
	(B) Agree	20	52.6*
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	2	5.3*
	(D) Disagree	6	15.8*
	(E) Strongly Disagree	2	5.3*
valid cases: 38 missing cases: 1 mean: 2.316 median: 2.050 std. dev.: 1.141			
30. I believe my role to be the same as that of an instructor of lower division courses at a four-year university.	(A) Strongly Agree	11	28.2
	(B) Agree	12	30.8
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	3	7.7
	(D) Disagree	9	23.1
	(E) Strongly Disagree	4	10.3
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 2.564 median: 2.208 std. dev.: 1.392			

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Variables	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (%) *adjusted for any missing cases
31. I willingly accept new teaching aids and techniques.	(A) Strongly Agree	13	33.3
	(B) Agree	20	51.3
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	5	12.8
	(D) Disagree	1	2.6
valid cases: 39	(E) Strongly Disagree	0	0
missing cases: 0			
mean: 1.846			
median: 1.825			
std. dev.: 0.745			
32. I attend as many faculty development workshops as possible.	(A) Strongly Agree	9	23.1
	(B) Agree	22	56.4
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	5	12.8
	(D) Disagree	2	5.1
valid cases: 39	(E) Strongly Disagree	1	2.6
missing cases: 0			
mean: 2.077			
median: 1.977			
std. dev.: 0.900			
33. I usually give my students mandatory comprehensive final examination.	(A) Strongly Agree	11	28.2
	(B) Agree	11	28.2
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	4	10.3
	(D) Disagree	10	25.6
	(E) Strongly Disagree	3	7.7
valid cases: 39			
missing cases: 0			
mean: 2.564			
median: 2.273			
std. dev.: 1.353			
34. I usually give only 1-2 tests per course per semester.	(A) Strongly Agree	1	2.6
	(B) Agree	0	0
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	3	7.7
	(D) Disagree	17	43.6
valid cases: 39	(E) Strongly Disagree	18	46.2
missing cases: 0			
mean: 4.308			
median: 4.412			
std. dev.: 0.832			

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Variables	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (%) *adjusted for any missing cases
35. I generally grade on a bell curve.	(A) Strongly Agree	1	2.6
	(B) Agree	1	2.6
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	0	0
valid cases: 39	(D) Disagree	17	43.6
missing cases: 0	(E) Strongly Disagree	20	51.3
mean: 4.385			
median: 4.525			
std. dev.: 0.847			
36. I direct my teaching towards the top students of my classes.	(A) Strongly Agree	0	0
	(B) Agree	4	10.3
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	8	20.5
	(D) Disagree	23	59.0
valid cases: 39	(E) Strongly Disagree	4	10.3
missing cases: 0			
mean: 3.692			
median: 3.826			
std. dev.: 0.800			
37. I often design non-punative remedial activities into my courses.	(A) Strongly Agree	3	7.9*
	(B) Agree	18	47.4*
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	7	18.4*
	(D) Disagree	7	18.4*
valid cases: 38	(E) Strongly Disagree	3	7.9*
missing cases: 1			
mean: 2.711			
median: 2.389			
std. dev.: 1.113			
38. I plan my lectures with little or no time allotted for questions or discussion.	(A) Strongly Agree	0	0
	(B) Agree	1	2.6
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	3	7.7
	(D) Disagree	24	61.5
valid cases: 39	(E) Strongly Disagree	11	28.2
missing cases: 0			
mean: 4.154			
median: 4.146			
std. dev.: 0.670			

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Variables	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (%) *adjusted for any missing cases
39. I often change my style of teaching from year to year.	(A) Strongly Agree	1	2.6
	(B) Agree	17	43.6
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	16	15.4
	(D) Disagree	14	35.9
	(E) Strongly Disagree	1	2.6
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 2.923 median: 2.750 std. dev.: 1.010			
40. I am familiar with the works of Jean Piaget.	(A) Strongly Agree	7	17.9
	(B) Agree	14	35.9
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	4	10.3
	(D) Disagree	8	20.5
	(E) Strongly Disagree	6	15.4
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 2.795 median: 2.393 std. dev.: 1.380			
41. I am familiar with Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives.	(A) Strongly Agree	9	23.1
	(B) Agree	10	25.6
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	3	7.7
	(D) Disagree	11	28.2
	(E) Strongly Disagree	6	15.4
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 2.872 median: 2.667 std. dev.: 1.454			
42. I believe that any student should be allowed to drop a course with a "W" until final examination week.	(A) Strongly Agree	5	12.8
	(B) Agree	8	20.5
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	7	17.9
	(D) Disagree	9	23.1
	(E) Strongly Disagree	10	25.6
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 3.282 median: 3.429 std. dev.: 1.395			

Table 2 (continued)

Item	Variables	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (%) *adjusted for any missing cases
43. Disregarding any change of salary, I would rather be employed at the university teaching upper division or graduate courses than here in a community college.	(A) Strongly Agree	0	0
	(B) Agree	2	5.1
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	7	17.9
	(D) Disagree	14	35.9
	(E) Strongly Disagree	16	41.0
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 4.128 median: 4.250 std. dev.: 0.894			
44. I plan to remain a community college teacher or administrator until I retire.	(A) Strongly Agree	11	28.2
	(B) Agree	11	28.2
	(C) Undecided or Neutral	14	35.9
	(D) Disagree	2	5.1
	(E) Strongly Disagree	1	2.6
valid cases: 39 missing cases: 0 mean: 2.256 median: 2.273 std. dev.: 1.019			

Table 3.1

Significant Cross Tabulations
Involving Item 2 (Sex)

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 2 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables: % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
16. I believe that if you know a subject, you can teach it.	Male	47.1	11.8	41.2	9.69	.008
	Female	10.5	0.0	89.5		
23. I believe that behavioral objectives are a great aid in learning.	Male	42.1	42.1	15.8	6.47	.004
	Female	78.9	21.1	0.0		
31. I willingly accept new teaching aids and techniques.	Male	64.4	26.3	5.3	7.125	.028
	Female	100.0	0.0	0.0		
32. I attend as many faculty development workshops as possible.	Male	63.2	21.1	15.8	6.00	.050
	Female	94.7	5.3	0.0		

Table 3.2

Significant Cross Tabulations
Involving Item 3 (Highest degree)

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 3 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables: % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
28. I believe that most students can be trusted.	Masters	94.1	0.0	5.9	8.88	.012
	Specialist or Doctorate	75.0	25.0	0.0		
31. I willingly accept new teaching aids and techniques.	Masters	91.2	5.9	2.9	7.43	.024
	Specialist or Doctorate	50.0	50.0	0.0		

Table 3.2 (continued)

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 3 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables: % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
38. I plan my lectures with little or no time allotted for questions or discussion.	Masters	2.9	2.9	94.1	10.93	.004
	Specialist or Doctorate	0.0	50.0	50.0		

Table 3.3

Significant Cross Tabulations
Involving Item 4 (Primary Assignment)

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 4 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables: % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
23. I believe that behavioral objectives are a great aid in learning.	Social or Behavioral Science	57.1	28.6	14.3	12.73	.048
	Business	87.5	12.5	0.0		
	Data Process., Math, Nat. Science	23.1	61.5	15.4		
	Humanities or Fine Arts	81.8	18.2	0.0		
33. I usually give my students mandatory comprehensive final examinations.	Social or Behavioral Science	28.6	0.0	71.4	18.94	.004
	Business	50.0	37.5	12.5		
	Data Process., Math, Nat. Science	84.6	7.7	7.7		
	Humanities or Fine Arts	45.5	0.0	54.5		

Table 3.3 (continued

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 4 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables: % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
40. I am familiar with Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives.	Social or Behavioral Science	71.4	14.3	14.3	14.83	.022
	Business	12.5	12.5	75.0		
	Data Process., Math, Science	38.5	15.4	46.2		
	Humanities or Fine Arts	90.0	9.0	9.1		

Table 3.4

Significant Cross Tabulations
Involving Item 5 (Years Taught in a Community College)

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 5 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables: % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
27. I believe that decisions concerning policy and curriculum should involve the community at large.	0- 5	42.9	35.7	21.4	13.11	.041
	6-10	33.3	22.2	44.4		
	11-15	100.0	0.0	0.0		
	16 or more	30.0	10.0	60.0		

Table 3.5

Significant Cross Tabulations
Involving Item 6
(Years Taught in a High School or Technical School)

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 6 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables: % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
18. I believe that a student should be given credit for the highest grade of a retaken course as opposed to having the grades averaged together.	0	86.4	9.1	4.5	5.97	.051
	1 or more	50.0	31.3	18.8		

Table 3.6

Significant Cross Tabulations
Involving Item 7
(Years Taught at a four-year College or University)

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 7 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables: % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
41. I am familiar with Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives.	0	58.3	0.0	41.7	6.04	.049
	1 or more	33.3	20.0	46.7		

Table 3.7

Significant Cross Tabulations
Involving Item 8
(Years Employed in Your Speciality Area Outside Teaching)

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 8 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables: % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
18. I believe that a student should be given credit for the highest grade of a retaken course as opposed to having the grades averaged together.	0	93.8	6.3	0.0	7.14	.023
	1 or more	54.5	27.3	18.2		

Table 3.7 (continued)

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 8 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
31. I willingly accept new teaching aids and teahniques.	0	70.6	29.4	0.0	7.94	.019
	1 or more	95.5	0.0	4.5		
33. I usually give my students mandatory comprehensive final examinations.	0	41.2	0.0	58.8	10.21	.006
	1 or more	68.2	18.2	13.6		

Table 3.8

Significant Cross Tabulations
Involving Item 10
(Hours of Professional Educational Course Work Completed)

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 10 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
16. I believe that if you know a subject, you can teach it.	0	57.1	7.1	35.7	9.76	.045
	1-18	16.7	0.0	83.3		
	19 or more	9.1	9.1	81.8		
41. I am familiar with Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives.	0	21.4	0.0	78.6	17.53	.0015
	1-18	46.2	23.1	30.8		
	19 or more	83.3	0.0	16.7		
42. I believe that any student should be allowed to drop a course with a "W" until final examinations week.	0	14.3	7.1	78.6	9.71	.046
	1-18	53.8	15.4	30.8		
	19 or more	33.3	33.3	33.3		

Table 3.9

Significant Cross Tabulations
Involving Item 11
(Have you taken a college course in the
history and philosophy of the Community College?)

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 11 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
42. I believe that any student should be allowed to drop a course with a "W" until final examinations week.	Yes	28.6	42.9	28.6	9.52	.009
	No	36.0	4.0	60.0		

Table 3.10

Significant Cross Tabulations
Involving Item 12
(Have you Attended an in-depth workshop or completed a
college course in test construction and evaluation?)

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 12 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
36. I direct my teaching towards the top students of my classes.	Yes	8.3	33.3	58.3	6.30	.043
	No	13.3	0.0	86.7		
41. I am familiar with Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives.	Yes	66.7	4.2	29.2	8.11	.017
	No	20.0	13.3	66.7		

Table 3.11

Significant Cross Tabulations
Involving Item 13
(Most of my students are enrolled
in two-year terminal degree programs.)

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 13 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% Disagree	Chi square	Sig.
40. I am familiar with the works of Jean Piaget.	Yes	27.8	22.2	50.0	8.72	.013
	No	75.0	0.0	25.0		

Table 3.12

Significant Cross Tabulations
Involving Item 15
(Have you Attended a community college as a student?)

36

Cross Tabulation Item number	Item 15 Variables	Cross Tabulation Variables % Agree	% neutral or undecided	% disagree	Chi square	Sig.
22. I am familiar with the construction and use of behavioral objectives.	Yes	70.0	10.0	20.0	7.01	.030
	No	96.9	3.4	0.0		

It becames readily apparent when one examines the previous table of cross tabulation that a much higher percent of females are student-oriented than are males. The tendency for male instructors to be subject matter-oriented academicians is not surprising when one considers the sexual roles established by our society.[50] The positive attitude shown by faculty members toward students in the cross tabulation of Item 28 to Item 3 is refreshing.

Although statistically significant, it comes as no shock that the holders of the higher degrees are less likely to accept new teaching ideas since they are probably more experienced and, thus have long found the teaching methods that work best for them. On the other hand, the academic nature of those possessing higher degrees apparently tends to create a higher degree of subject-orientedness than those possessing Bachelors or Masters Degrees.

It can be seen that instructors of data processing, mathematics, and natural science are also more likely to give mandatory comprehensive examinations while having the least respect for behavioral objectives -- although their utilization is a highly "scientific" method of teaching. This apparent contradiction is possibly the result of those same instructors having been

educated in traditional universities where they have not experienced courses in teaching techniques. In the defense of these instructors, it should be noted that business instructors rank even lower in their knowledge of the works of Jean Piaget.

An interesting correlation surfaces when the results of Item 27 are cross tabulated with those of Item 5. One hundred percent of those instructors who have taught in the community college for eleven to fifteen years agreed that decisions concerning policy and curriculum should involve the community at large. As can be seen, this percentage is much greater than any other experience group. If one turns the clock back eleven to fifteen years, the "golden age" of American community colleges would be in full swing and those hired would thus be highly conscious of the idea of community input. Since that period, it appears that, at least in this case, community colleges have become more university-oriented, possibly due to neglect in the realm of faculty/staff development.

Except in the cross tabulation of Item 18 to Item 6, persons having a background in education as opposed to those in a technical field tend to be more student-oriented, although not always overly so. Those having worked in industry quite readily accept new teaching aids and techniques in order to overcome their assumed deficiencies in teacher education.

An unfortunate situation is shown to exist when Item 40 is cross tabulated to Item 13. Only 27.8 percent of the instructors of two-year degree students were familiar with Jean Piaget's work as compared to the seventy-five percent of the four-year degree instructors.

A second unfortunate set of circumstances is indicated when Item 22 is cross-tabulated to Item 15 where those who attended community colleges as students are less familiar with behavioral objectives than their counterparts. This final significant cross tabulation shows a lack of modern teaching techniques among two-year instructors in this state. Quite possibly those having attended a community college did so in Kentucky where, as previously mentioned, ties to the University are quite strong. It would be interesting to see the results of a similiar study in a state who's community colleges are a separate entity.

Chapter 4
CONCLUSIONS

In light of the findings of this study, attention must be brought once again upon hiring practices, especially those involving the employment of instructors of two-year terminal degree students.

Rarely does one come equipped when initially employed with the broad array of skills needed to become an effective community college instructor. One may possess an impressive list of academic achievements in a particular field or practical work experience but that does not qualify the applicant to teach, at least not at the community college.

Much discussion has taken place concerning the value of a Ph. D. degree at the community college level. Although holders of Ph. D.'s are not unqualified to teach at this particular level due strictly to their specialization, care must be taken in avoiding placement within two-year programs of intellectual elitists who are more interested in research and publishing than teaching a mixed variety of students. Presently the fear, exists that due to low turnover of full-time faculty, many instructors will earn their doctorate while employed, and in the process, will become tainted with elitism. [51, 52]

The tabulations of Item 21 of Table 1, p. #23, clearly indicate this particular faculty's opinion of the value of a Ph. D. at the community college level.

Whether or not one possesses a Ph. D., a community college instructor--according to Charles and Summerer--should have the following characteristics:

1. His credentials should give clear evidence that he can be effective with students in the classroom and individual relationships. He should not have the attitude that all responsibility for learning rests with the student.

2. He should have at least a master's degree in his subject-matter field. He should also demonstrate continuing interest in his field through reading, further graduate study, travel, and related research.

3. He should have positive attitudes toward extracurricular activities and an understanding of the importance of such activities for the social maturity of students.

4. He should have some courses in education which will help him be a better teacher and help him have a better concept of the educational mission of the two-year college.

5. He should have a well-adjusted personality which will aid him in establishing effective personal relationships with others in the community.

6. He should be willing to become a part of the activities of the community.[53]

In several instances personality has been established as the most important component in teacher effectiveness.[54, 55] Blocker invision that the successful college teacher is the:

> kind of person who has been described by Abraham Maslow as self-actualizing, by Karen Horney as self-realizing, by Gayle Privette as transcendent-functioning, and by Carl Rogers as fully functioning. Other humanistic psychologists have described such healthy personalities as open to experience, democratic, accepting, understanding, caring, supporting, approving, loving, nonjudgmental. They tolerate ambiguity; their decisions come from within rather than from without; they have a zest for life, for experiencing, for touching, tasting, feeling, knowing. They risk involvement; they reach out for experiences; they are not afraid to encounter others or themselves. They believe that man is basically good, and given the right conditions, will move in positive directions. (O'Banion, 1971).[56]

Combs reports that good teachers "perceives others as able rather than unable, as friendly instead of unfriendly, as worthy rather than unworthy, as internally motivated rather than externally controlled, as dependable instead of undependable and as helpful

rather than obstructive."[57]

In attempting to establish just what percent of the faculty are student-oriented teachers as opposed to subject-matter academicians, selected questionnaire responses were categorized in the following manner:

TABLE 4
Philosophical Tendencies

Response		Questionnaire Item
Student-oriented	Subject-oriented	
Disagree	Agree	16. I believe that if you know a subject, you can teach it.
Agree	Disagree	17. I believe that a student should be able to retake a course for credit after having audited it.
Agree	Disagree	18. I believe that a student should be given credit for the highest grade of a retaken course as opposed to having the grades averaged together.
Disagree	Agree	19. I believe that faculty should be allowed additional time for research and publishing.
Disagree	Agree	20. I believe that a major goal of the community college is to weed out "unfit" students before they transfer to the university.
Agree	Disagree	29. I believe in a college admission policy which allows any adult applicant to attend.
Disagree	Agree	30. I believe my role to be the same as that of an instructor of lower division courses at a four-year university.
Disagree	Agree	33. I usually give my students mandatory comprehensive final examinations.
Disagree	Agree	36. I direct my teaching towards the top students of my classes.
Agree	Disagree	37. I often design non-punitive remedial activities into my courses.
Agree	Disagree	42. I believe that any student should be allowed to drop a course with a "W" until final examinations week.

As indicated in Table 1, of the thirty-nine faculty members surveyed, sixteen were those primarily of proclaimed Baccalaureate students while eighteen were principally involved with those students enrolled in the Associate Degree program of Nursing, Secretarial Administration, Data Processing Technology, or Management Technology with its options in Business, Banking, or Real Estate. The following table compares the general teaching philosophy of instructors of primarily two-year degree students to those of four-year degree students.

TABLE 5
A Comparison of Teaching Philosophies and Preparations
of Instructors of Two- and Four-year Degree Students

Four-year		Two-year		
Absolute Frequency	%*	Absolute Frequency	%*	Questionnaire Item
7	43.8	15	83.3	8. Had previously worked in speciality area outside of teaching.
6	37.5	14	77.8	9. Had completed at least one hour of professional education course work.
4	25.0	7	38.9	11. Had completed a college course in the history and philosophy of the community college.
6	40.0*	4	22.2	Agreed with Item 16; I believe that if you know a subject, you can teach it.
12	80.0*	14	77.8	Agreed with Item 17: I believe that a student should be able to retake a course for credit after having audited it.
11	73.3*	12	66.7	Agreed with Item 18; I believe that a student should be given credit for the highest grade of a retaken course as opposed to having the grades averaged together.
6	40.0*	12	66.7	Agreed with Item 19; I believe that faculty should be allowed additional time for research and publishing.
1	6.3	3	16.7	Agreed with Item 20; I believe that a major goal of the community college is to weed out "unfit" students before they transfer to the university.
13	81.3	16	88.9	Agreed with Item 22; I am familiar with the construction and use of behavioral objectives.
10	66.7*	14	77.8	Agreed with Item 29; I believe in a college admission policy which allows any adult applicant to attend.
7	43.8	13	72.2	Agreed with Item 30; I believe my role to be the same as that of an instructor of lower division courses at a four-year university.
8	50.0	13	72.2	Agreed with Item 33; I usually give my students mandatory comprehensive final examinations.

TABLE 5 (cont.)
A Comparison of Teaching Philosophies and Preparations of Instructors of Two- and Four-year Degree Students

Four-year		Two-year		
Absolute Frequency	%*	Absolute Frequency	%*	Questionnaire Item
7	43.8	9	50.0*	Agreed with Item 37; I often design non-punitive remedial activities into my courses.
12	75.0	5	27.8	Agreed with Item 40; I am familiar with the works of Jean Piaget.
4	25.0	6	33.3	Agreed with Item 42; I believe that any student should be allowed to drop a course with a "W" until final examinations week.

*adjusted for any missing cases

One would suspect that two-year terminal degree programs would demand instructors to be highly student-oriented. By the same token, any amount of student-orientedness formed among instructors of four-year degree students could be simply considered a luxury. In Table 5 it can be seen that in reference to Items 19 and 30, a surprisingly high number of two-year degree instructors are seemingly in disagreement with their job descriptions, quite possibly out of ignorance of them. The large number of two-year instructors in agreement with Item 33 suggests that many still cling to archaic grading procedures, particularly in this community college with its close ties with the university. If one accepts the historical philosophy of the community college, ideally no instructors of two-year students would agree with Items 16, 18, 20, 24, and 29, while agreeing with Items 17, 20, 22, 37, 40, and 42.

The discrepancies which exist between the suggested ideal and those shown in Table 5 indicate that additional faculty development is needed in this area. Interestingly enough, in some instances (Items 19, 20, 30, 33, and 40) the four-year

instructors appear to be far more student-oriented than those of primarily two-year terminal degree students!

In the attempt to catagorize teachers into Brawer's classifications as outlined in Chapter 2, attention must first be given to Table 22, p. 29, where it can be seen that 57% of the faculty agreed with Item 44: I plan to remain a community college teacher or administrator until I retire. Although her "ladder climbers" would be eliminated from this group, it is difficult to decide how this percentage is divided between "end of the roaders" and "defined purpose routers."

In order to determine what percent of the faculty fall into Brawer's "ladder climber" classifications (which are essentailly Freedman's "graduate students"), a cross tabulation was made of those from twenty-two to thirty years of age who agreed with Item 44. Of the six faculty members populating this particular age group, half responded in agreement to Item 44 while the other three were undecided. This implied that at most, only 7.7 percent of the faculty could be of the "ladder climber" variety at this time.

Brawer's "job-holders" were not tabulated in this study since only full-time faculty were surveyed.

The percentage of faculty members populating her classification of "defined-purpose routers" was obtained by tabulating the number of those outside of the "ladder climbers" who agreed with questionnaire Item 29 while generally disagreeing with Items 16, 20, 30, 34, 36, and 43. Of the twenty-five faculty members who agreed with Item 29, seventeen definitely disagreed with at least four of the six selected items. If this is an indication

of defined purposeness, then it represents seventeen of the thirty-nine surveyed faculty members or 43.59 percent.

TABLE 6
An Estimation of the Percent of the
Elizabethtown Faculty Populating
Brawer's Classifications of Teacher Types

Classification	Absolute Frequency	%
End of the roaders	19-22	48.71-56.41
Ladder climbers	0- 3	0.0 - 7.69
Job holders	0.0	0.0
Defined purpose router	17-20	43.59-51.28

If one is to categorize faculty by the Freeman classification scheme, estimation can be obtained by cross tabulating the following items:

1. "Professors" - cross tabulate Item 7 with Item 43.
2. "Graduate students" - cross tabulate the responses of those in age catagory A (22-30) to Item 44. If they are indeed "graduate students," then members of this age group who disagreed with Item 44 would probably agree with both Items 20 and 30.
3. "High schoolers" - tabulate those indicating high school experience (Item 6) while not indicating University experience (Item 7)

TABLE 7
An Estimation of the Percent of the
Elizabethtown Faculty Populating
Freeman's Classifications of Teacher Types

Classification	Absolute Frequency	%
Professors	2	5.13
Graduate students	0-3	0.0 - 7.69
High schoolers	8	20.51
Others	26-29	66.67-73.36

Obviously Freeman's system fails to categorize a large percentage of the faculty when based upon the results of this survey.

A third system of classification is that of Boart's in which community college instructors are simply catagorized as (1) "high schoolers," (2) "university professors," and (3) "business dropouts."[58] When the faculty of Elizabethtown is subjected to this system, the following results are obtained:

TABLE 8
An Estimation of the Percent of the Elizabethtown Faculty Populating Boart's Classifications of Teacher Types

Classification	Absolute Frequency	%
High Schoolers	8-17	26.67-56.67
University professors	6-15	20.0 -66.67
Business Dropouts	8-14	26.67-46.67
Other	9	23.08

The range of frequencies in the above table exist where overlaps occur between "high schooler" and "university professor," "high schooler" and "business dropout," or "university professor" and "business dropout." Tabulations were obtained by analyzing Items 6, 7, and 8 of Table 1.

In addition to classifying teacher types at this particular institution, another goal of the study was to categorize teaching techniques. Of the three styles discussed in Chapter 2, the only hint of authoritativeness determined from the survey was obtained from Item 38. Table 1 indicates that, only one faculty member responded in an agreeable manner. Personal observations on the

part of this student indicate that in reality, many others practice this method of teaching. Although they may plan for questions and discussions within their lectures, few may actually take place. It can be stated safely that the spontaneous approach to teaching is rarely practiced here for two reasons. One is because of the limted experience of lower division students, while another is that at this institution, the faculty member would probably be dismissed. Thus the faculty of Elizabethtown is divided pretty much as expected between authoritarianism and the middle of the road nuclear styles of instruction. Even though a statistically significant cross tabulation occurred between Items 38 and 2 (see Table 3.2, p. 31), noting the extremely small percent of faculty possessing degrees above the masters level, this cross tabulation seems hardly significant after all.

When it comes to hiring a particular person to teach at a community college it is hoped that the candidate has completed at least one course in teaching techniques, testing, and educational psychology, as well as a course in the history and philosophy of the community college. It should be noted that the results of this study netted no significant relationships between student-orientedness and the number of education hours completed, nor any were found between student-orientedness and prior attendance at a community college. In lieu of a teaching background, the prospective employee ideally should be non-authoritarian, open to new ideas, and interested in helping students of all backgrounds while saddled with a variety of courses. Therefore some have generally ruled out those with

extensive teaching experience at four-year institutions as well as graduate students who's sole preparation is for service in other graduate schools.[59, 60] The results of this study among others indicate that excluding the above varieties, females would obviously make the best community college instructors due to their inherent interest in student achievement.

All too often it appears, many teachers are hired through a "marriage of convenience" based on subjective decisions involving salary demands, academic credentials, and general personality rather than those concerning the specific traits mentioned perviously.[61] It could thus be found only later that a high degree of conflict exists between the teacher's philosophy and that of the institution. If this should exist, it presents a potentially dangerous situation. If the employing institution should in fact hire someone with less than sparkling credentials, it is the instution's responsibility to offer professional growth opportunities in the form of faculty development programs. If inservices are to be successful it is mandatory that the teachers be those persons receptive to new ideas. As echoed by others, not only should teaching methodology be taught, but just as importantly, indoctrination of community college philosophy.[62, 63] Furthermore, allowances should be made thru inservice training for instructors to remain current within their teaching fields.

An alternative to costly comprehensive inservice programs is the idea of state certification of community college teachers. This practice, although not widespread, may experience a resurgance in the future unless employment ceases to be conducted on the basis of "If you know it, you can teach it."

It has been projected that the total number of high school graduates will decline between 250,000 and 335,000 each year thru 1990.[64] Such a drastic decline in college enrollment will naturally result in severe competition for students among colleges. If community colleges are to survive they must truly live up to their image of teaching instututions

REFERENCES

[1]Joseph Justman and Walter H. Mais, College Teaching: Its Practice and Potential (New York, Harper and Row, 1956), p. 93.

[2]John E. Roueche and Oscar G. Mink, Holistic Literacy in College Teaching (New York: Media Systems Corporation, 1980), p. 4.

[3]Roueche, ob. cit., p. 2.

[4]Ibid., p. 3.

[5]Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer, The American Community College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982), p. 36.

[6]Rober Garrison, Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967), pp. 77-78.

[7]Arthur M. Cohen, Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969), p. xvi.

[8]Cohen and Brawer, op. cit., p. 311.

[9]Charles R. Monroe, Profile of the Community College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), pp. 26-32.

[10]Arthur M. Cohen, The Two-Year College Instructor Today (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977), p. 19.

[11]Monroe, op. cit., pp. 37-45.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Cohen and Brawer, op. cit., p. 157.

[14]Terry O'banion, Teachers for Tomorrow (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press (nid)), p. V.

[15]Ibid.

[16]Arthur M. Cohen, The Two-Year College Instructor Today (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977) p. 39.

[17]Obanion, op. cit., p. 52.

[18]Ibid.

[19]Robert E. Engel, The Professional Training of Community College Teachers, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center: ERIC Document ED 075 347, 1973.

[20]Arthur M. Cohen, "Evaluation of Faculty," Community College Review, II (Summer, 1974), p. 12.

[21]Justman and Mais, op. cit., p. 30.

[22]Arthur M. Cohen, Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969) p. 86.

[23]Ibid., p. 100.

[24]Cohen and Brawer, op. cit., p. 161.

[25]O'banion, op. cit., p. 64.

[26]Cohen and Brawer, op. cit., p. 166.

[27]Monroe, op. cit., p. 245.

[28]Cohen and Brawer, op. cit., p. 84.

[29]Monroe, op. cit., p. 252.

[30]Arthur M. Cohen, The Two-Year College Instructor Today (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977), p. 82.

[31]O'banion, op.cit., p. 56.

[32]Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Brawer, "Focus on Today's Humanities," Community College Review, IV (Spring, 1977), p. 254.

[33]Cohen, op. cit., p. 81.

[34]Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B Brawer, The American Community College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982), p. 285.

[35]Monroe, op. cit., p. 252

[36]O'banion, op. cit., p. 56.

[37]Cohen, op. cit., p. 81.

[38]Ibid.

[39]Cohen, op. cit., p. 40.

[40]Monroe, op. cit., p. 287

[41]Ibid., p. 88.

[42]Robert Sherwin, "The Presentation of Educational Self in the Classroom," Excellence in University Teaching, eds. Thomas H. Buxton and Keith W. Prichard (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1975), pp. 31-35.

[43]Ibid.

[44]Ibid.

[45]Ibid.

[46]Stephen Romine, "What is Good Teaching?," Community College Review, II (Fall, 1974), p. 34.

[47]Margaret L. Ford, "Excellence in Teaching, What Does It Really Mean?" (paper presented at the International Conference on Improving University Teaching, Lausanne, July, 1980).

[48]Gerald A. Yoakum and Robert G. Simpson, Modern Methods and Techniques of Teaching (New York: McMillan Company, 1949).

[49]Monroe, op. cit., p. 253.

[50]Cohen and Brawer, p. 81.

[51]O'banion, op. cit., p. 58.

[52]Anita Taylor, Can Community Colleges Survive the Ph.D. Glut?? Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED. 088 548, October, 1973.

[53]Clyde E. Blocker and others, The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965), p. 163.

[54]Cohen and Brawer, op. cit., p. 153.

[55]Monroe, op. cit., p. 254.

[56]O'banion, op. cit., p. 61.

[57]Ibid

[58]Ibid., p. 62.

[59]Engel, op. cit., p. 3.

[60]William C. Butt, "Criteria for Staffing the Small College" Community College Review, III (September, 1975), p. 51.

[61]Engel, op. cit., p. 3.

[62]O'banion, op. cit., p. 58.

[63]Ibid., p. 65.

[64]Roueche and Mink, op. cit., p. 4.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bleyer, Dorothy R. "Higher Educations Omission: The Preparation of Community College Teachers", Community College Review, VI (winter, 1979) pp. 46-50.

Blocker, Clyde E., and others. The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

Boy, Angelo V. and Gerald J. Pine. Expanding the Self: Personal Growth for Teachers. Dubque: William C. Brown Company, 1971.

Brawer, Florence B. Community College Teacher Preparation: Past, Present, and Future, U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 071 661, March, 1973.

Butt, William C., "Criteria for Staffing the Small College", Community College Review, III (September, 1975) pp. 50-54.

Cohen, Arthur M. Dateline '79: Heretical Concepts for the Community College, Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969.

_____."Evaluation of faculty", Community College Review, II (Summer, 1974) pp. 12-21

_____. The Two-Year College Instructor Today. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977.

_____ and Florence B. Brawer. "Focus on Today's Humanities ", Community College Review, IV, (Spring, 1977), pp. 51-57.

_____ and Florence B. Brawer. The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

Day, William G. Professional Preparation and Experience of Instructors in Community Junior Colleges and Technical Institutions. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center ERIC Document ED 907 923, 1974.

Engel, Robert E. The Professional Training of Community College Teachers. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 075 347, 1973

Ford, Margaret L. "Excellence in Teaching, What Does It Really Mean?", Paper presented at the International Conference on Improving University Teaching, Lausanne, July, 1980.

Garrison, Rober. Junior College faculty: Issues and Problems. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

Harrison, J. Derek., "Ph. D. Faculty in Community Colleges", Community College Review, VI (winter, 1979) pp. 24-28.

Justman, Joseph and Walter H. Mais. College Teaching: Its Practice and Potential. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.

Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

O'banion, Terry. Teachers for Tomorrow. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1972.

Oviatt, Alan B. "Reflections on Effective Teaching," Excellence in University Teaching, eds. Thomas H. Buxton and Keith W. Prichard. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1975.

Parsons, Gary L. and others. Experience as a Community College Student as a Criterion for the Selection of Community College Teachers. U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 093 438, December, 1973.

Romine, Stephen. "What is "Good Teaching"?", Community College Review, II (Fall, 1974) pp. 33-39.

Segner, Ken B. "Teachers need Breadth of Subject Preparation", Community College Review, III (September, 1975), pp. 4-5.

Sherwin, Robert. "The Presentation of Educational Self in the Classroom," Excellence in University Teaching, eds. Thomas H. Buxton and Keith W. Prichard. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1975.

Smith, Milton L. "No Omission Here: One University's Program Preparing Community College Teachers", Community College Review, VIII (Fall, 1980). pp. 47-49.

Taylor, Anita. Can Community Colleges Survive the Ph. D. Glut? U.S., Educational Resources Information Center, ERIC Document ED 088 548, October, 1973.

Thornton, James W. Jr. The Community Junior College, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.

Vdolf, Roy. The College Instructor's Guide to Teaching and Academia. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1976.

Yoakum, Gerald A. and Robert G. Simpson. Modern Methods and Techniques of Teaching. New York: McMillan Company, 1949.

APPENDIX

TO: Full-time Faculty Members
Elizabethtown Community College
Elizabethtown, KY 42701

FROM: Charles C. Cantrell

RE: A Survey of Teaching Philosophies, Experience and Preparation

I am respectfully requesting your participation in this study related to the fulfillment of my Educational Specialist degree requirements at Tennessee Technological University. Your complete honesty is highly appreciated.

All information is anonymous. A copy of the results of this study will be furnished upon request.

Please use a #2 pencil to mark your answer sheet. Thank you for your co-operation.

BACKGROUND INVENTORY

1. Age: (A) 22-30 (B) 31-40 (C) 41-49 (D) 50-59 (E) 60 or over

2. Sex: (A) Male (B) Female

3. Highest degree held:
(A) Bachelor's (B) Master's (C) Specialist (D) Doctorate

4. In which area is your primary assignment?
(A) Social or Behavioral Science
(B) Business or Related Areas
(C) Data Processing, Mathematics, Natural Science, or Related Technologies
(D) Humanities, Education or Fine Arts

5. How many years have you taught in a community college?
(A) 0-5 (B) 6-10 (C) 11-15 (D) 16-20 (E) 21 or over

6. How many years have you taught in a high school or technical school?
(A) 0 (B) 1-5 (C) 6-10 (D) 11-15 (E) 16 or over

7. How many years have you taught at a four-year college or university?
(A) 0 (B) 1-5 (C) 6-10 (D) 11-15 (E) 16 or over

8. How many years have you worked in your area outside of teaching?
(A) 0 (B) 1-5 (C) 6-10 (D) 11-15 (E) 16 or over

9. How many semester hours of course work have you completed beyond your last degree?
(A) 0 (B) 1-9 (C) 10-18 (D) 19-27 (E) 28 or more

10. How many semester hours of professional educational course work have you completed?
(A) 0 (B) 1-9 (C) 10-18 (D) 19-27 (E) 28 or more

11. Have you taken a college course in the history and philosophy of the community college?
(A) Yes (B) No

12. Have you attended an in-depth workshop or completed a college course in test construction and evaluation?
(A) Yes (B) No

13. Are most of your students enrolled in two-year terminal degree programs?
(A) Yes (B) No (C) Uncertain

14. Have you previously served as a student teacher in a high school or as an intern in a community college?
(A) Yes (B) No

15. Have you ever attended a community college as a student?
(A) Yes (B) No

FOR EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS PLEASE MARK YOUR ANSWER SHEET IN THE MANNER BELOW.

(A) Strongly Agree
(B) Agree
(C) Undecided or Neutral
(D) Disagree
(E) Strongly Disagree

16. I believe that if you know a subject, you can teach it.

17. I believe that a student should be able to retake a course for credit after having audited it.

18. I believe that a student should be given credit for the highest grade of a retaken course as opposed to having the grades averaged together.

19. I believe that faculty should be allowed additional time for research and publishing.

20. I believe that a major goal of the community college is to weed out "unfit" students before they transfer to the university.

21. I believe that every instructor should possess a doctoral degree.

22. I am familiar with the construction and use of behavioral objectives.

23. I believe that behavioral objectives are a great aid in learning.

24. I believe that in order to reduce the number of college applicants, an ACT cutoff should be instituted.

25. I believe that the memorization of detail is an effective method of mind development.

26. I believe that politics are important in obtaining a teaching job at a community college.

27. I believe that decisions concerning policy and curriculum should involve the community at large.

28. I believe that most students can be trusted.

29. I believe in a college admission policy which allows any adult applicant to attend.

30. I believe my role to be the same as that of an instructor of lower division courses at a four-year university.

31. I willingly accept new teaching aids and techniques.

32. I attend as many faculty development workshops as possible.

33. I usually give my students mandatory comprehensive final examinations.

34. I usually give only 1-2 tests per course per semester.

35. I generally grade on a bell curve.

36. I direct my teaching towards the top students of my classes.

37. I often design non-punitive remedial activities into my courses.

38. I plan my lectures with little or no time allotted for questions or discussion.

39. I often change my style of teaching from year to year.

40. I am familiar with the works of Jean Piaget.

41. I am familiar with Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives.

42. I believe that any student should be allowed to drop a course with a "W" until final examinations week.

43. Disregarding any change of salary, I would rather be employed at the university teaching upper division or graduate courses than here in a community college.

44. I plan to remain a community college teacher or administrator until I retire.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

JUL 26 1985